VISVA-BHARATI ANNALS

VOL. VII

EDITED BY

P. C. BAGCHI M.A., DR. ES LETTRES (PARIS), F. A. S. B.

Director of Research Studies, Visva-Bharati

VISVA-BHARATI

SANTINIKETAN

1955

VISVA-BHARATI ANNALS

Editor Dr P. C. BAGCHI, M. A., Dr-es-lettres (Paris), Fellow, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Hony. Member, Ecole Francaise d'Exteme-Orient, Director of Research.

Volume I. 237 Pp. 1947. Rupees Ten.

The Volume contains a number of original studies : i) *The first Parajika of the Dharmagupta-Vinaya* by P. Pradhan ; ii) *Comparative Study of the Avadana Sataka and its Chinese translation* by Fa Chow ; iii) *The Arthapadasutra,* Part I by Dr. P. V. Bapat ; iv) *Two Medical Texts in Chinese Translations* by Satiranjan Sen and v) *Political Relations between Bengal and China in the Pathan Period* : by Dr. P. C. Bagchi.

Volume II. 240 Pp. 1949. Rupees Ten.

It contains three original studies : i) *Karatalaratna of Bhavaviveka* by N. Aiyaswami Sastri ; ii) *Vajrasuci* by Sujit Kumar Mukherji, and iii) *Bodhicittotpada-sutra-sastra of Vasubandhu* by Santi Bhiksu.

Volume III. 250 Pp. 1950. Rupees Ten.

The volume contains three original studies : i) *Arthapadasutra,* Part II, by Dr. P. V. Bapat : ii) *A Dhyana text from Chinese* by Sujit Kumar Mukherji ; and iii) *Comparative Study of the different Chinese Translation of the Sigalovada sutta* by Bhadanta Pannasiri.

Volume IV. 240 Pp. 1952. Rupees Ten.

The contents of this volume are : i) a detailed study of the *Life and Works of Shah Walli Allah,* the renowned 18th century authority on Islamic Theology, by Dr. F. M. Asiri, who also contributes an important note on a Visva-Bharati manuscript, *Chahar Chaman* by Chandra Bhan Brahman, the official chronicler of Shah Jehan ; ii) an article, comprising four independent studies on certain *Problems of Islamic History* one of which is about an official communique of Sultan Firuz is contributed by N. B. Roy, ; iii) a comprehensive study by Chittaranjan Das of certain aspects of *Medieval Religion and Literature of Orissa.* He gives a brief history of the Panchasakha, with particular reference to the works of Achyutananda, and attempts a detailed study of the manuscript text of Chaitanya Bhagavata of Iswar Das.

To be had of
The Visvabharati Publishing Department
6/3 Dwarkanath Tagore Lane, Calcutta

PRICE RUPEES TWELVE

Printed and Published by Kalidas Chatterji,
Santiniketan Press, Santiniketan, Birbhum.

CONTENTS

PAGE

1. THE SAKAS IN INDIA
   by Dr. Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya 1

2. VṚTTIVALLABHA—A CHĀYĀNĀṬAKA
   by Gouriswar Bhattacharya 127

VṚTTIVALLABHA – A CHĀYĀNĀṬAKA

VṚTTIVALLABHA—A CHĀYĀNAṬAKA

Vṛttivallabha, a Sanskrit drama of a small compass, viz., one act and composed by one Vyāsalaghukavi, as is clearly mentioned in the colophon, is a manuscript of thirteen pages of hand-made paper.[1] The script is Devanāgarī that is fairly old, the exact date of which is very difficult to assign. The manuscript is in good condition in general, only a few letters being eaten up by the insects. Considering the character of errors which have crept into the manuscript it is very difficult to ascertain whether the author himself is the scribe or not. We find no name given as the copyist's. No date of composition or of copying is mentioned. Of course, the amount of historical data which have been furnished by the author may serve our purpose in ascertaining the date to a degree of certainty. We have kept that discussion separate for another chapter and avoid repetition here. I enquired to various institutions of Sanskrit manuscript collection about the drama but none of them had any information about it. I consulted also numerous catalogues of published and unpublished Sanskrit manuscripts but to no gain. So considering that it is a unique manuscript of this unpublished work, we are going to publish it. And in doing this we have, whenever possible, corrected some of the scribal errors, but as a whole the text is represented as it is. The drama though short, is very interesting for reasons which will be discussed here in brief with all available informations.

In the colophon it is expressly stated that the drama is a chāyānāṭaka composed by one Vyāsalaghukavi.[2] From the clear mentioning of the term chāyānaṭaka one may feel naturally tempted to identify it with the famous "Shadow-play" as it was understood by some of the scholars and the display of which is still prevalent in South India and in the Far East. Before accepting this equation as final we should carefully discuss the various views put forward by scholars for and against identifying a chāyānāṭaka with the shadow-play and their own explanation of the term. The most exhaustive and scholarly written article about the chāyānaṭaka comes from the pen of Dr. S. K. De.[3] In an estimation of the merit

---

1 Ms. No. 1530, Viśva-Bhārati Sanskrit manuscript collection.

2 इति श्रीव्यासलघुकविविरचितं वृत्तिवल्लभं नाम छायानाटकं समाप्तम् ।

3 The problem of the Mahānāṭaka—Dr. S. K. De, The Indian Historical Quarterly—Vol. VII. No. 1, pp. 587-627. Most of the references for this article have been taken from Dr. De.

and the character of the Mahānāṭaka as a dramatic composition Dr. De has discussed a good deal about the nature of the chāyā-nāṭaka,— as understood by different scholars of different nationalities — and gave his own views. I have been much benefited by his article which, I think, is the most comprehensive work in this field. Dr. De resented strongly against branding the Mahānāṭaka as a chāyānāṭaka and this led the scholar to discuss in detail the true implication of the term.

Though there is an apparent similarity between the two terms, shadow-play and chāyānāṭaka, yet their representation being in two different languages, it becomes very difficult to establish the identity. For the shadow-play, performed in local dialects (mainly South-Indian), has no connection with Sanskrit, while the chāyānāṭaka was composed in Sanskrit even when the local dialects had come into vogue. The question of survival, i. e., from Sanskrit chāyānāṭaka to vernacular shadow-play is, however, open to criticism. We need not enter into the knotty problem about the origin of Drama, quite irrelevant for this article, which is associated by some scholars with the shadow-play.[1] Even if we accept the theory for the sake of argument or admit that the history of the shadow-play goes back to a hoary antiquity we are never placed in a better position as to know the exact relation of the chāyānāṭaka with the shadow-play. So overlooking all by-the-way and remote propositions we will devote all our attention to find out the real implication of the term, chāyānāṭaka.

As the term chāyā can easily be translated as 'shadow', a chāyā-nāṭaka was identified with the shadow-play in which the shadow is the most important element. The most powerful support came from the stage direction (though by a wrong interpretation) of a work called Dharmābhyudaya of Meghaprabhācārya.[2] In the colophon the work is styled as Dharmābhyudaya nāma chāyānāṭya-prabandhaḥ. As the king (the hero of the drama) takes the vow to become an ascetic, the stage direction follows, "yamanikāntarād yati-veṣa-dhārī putrakas-tatra sthāpanīyaḥ (p. 15)". The correct translation of the passage should be, "from the innerside of the curtain

1 See Keith—Sanskrit Drama.

2 Ed. in the Jaina-Ātmānanda Granthamālā series (Bhavnagar 1918) and a brief résumé given by Hultzsch in ZDMG, IXXV, p. 69.

is to be placed a puppet wearing the dress of an ascetic." But unfortunately the passage has been translated otherwise, frankly speaking in a wrong way, and this has helped to serve the purpose of the shadow-play-theorists. Hultzsch has translated it as, "in the interior of the curtain is a puppet which bore the dress of an ascetic, to appear there." This translation is ambiguous. The term 'tatra', as translated here, means 'behind the screen' and not 'on the stage.' This interpretation has helped them to find out a clue of the shadow projection and thereby identify the drama with the shadow-play. The stage-direction, on the other hand clearly indicates that the work is a specimen of a puppet-show and no trace of a shadow-play is to be found in it. It is simply to be understood that a puppet is to be placed on the stage from the inner side of the screen i. e., from the nepathya. In other chāyānāṭakas, not even in Dūtāṅgada, probably the earliest one of the variety and considered to be the typical one by Pischel and Lüders, no such stage directions are to be met with. Our present drama, Vṛttivallabha, which specifically calls itself a chāyānāṭaka in the colophon, lacks in above dramatic direction.

These chāyānāṭakas, save for their self-adopted title, are no way different in construction from an ordinary play.[1] Dharmābhyudaya, which styles itself as a chāyānāṭya-prabandha, in the colophon, is a short play of one act with three or four scenes and depicts the Indian legend of king Daśārṇabhadra. It has regular Nāndī, prarocanā and prastāvanā, in which the sūtra-dhāra speaks of actors (Śailūṣa) and the performance as acting (Abhinaya), and ends in a verse, technically to be called a Bharatavākya, uttered by one of the characters. Sanskrit, and sometimes Prākṛta also has been used through out the drama in prose and verse dialogues. The same characteristics are to be noticed in other chāyānāṭakas. Rāmadevavyāsa, author of three such plays, viz, Subhadrā-pariṇaya,[2] Rāmābhyudaya[3] and Pāṇḍavābhyudaya,[4]

---

1 I am informed that in South India one act Sanskrit plays are called chāyānāṭakas and they have no connection with the shadow-play. But I am not definite about it.

2 Bendall's catalogue of MSS in the British Museum, no. 271, pp. 106f., Lévi—Le Théatre Indien, p, 242.

3 Bendall op. cit. no. 272, pp. 107-8, Peterson's Alwar catalogue, extracts p. 72 ; Descriptive cat. of Skt. MSS in the Govt. Oriental MSS Library, Madras, no. 12626., Lévi, op. cit. p, 242.

4 Eggeling, India office Manuscripts, vii, p. 1602, no. 4187 (2858 b)

was under the patronage of the Haihaya princes of the Kalacuri branch of Rāyapura of the first half of the 13th century.[1] The subject matter of these dramas has been taken from the famous incidents of the two Epics, and their construction is similar to a regular drama in such a degree that Lüders refused to accept them as chāyānāṭakas. The reason behind the self-adopted name is quite difficult to be ascertained. Haridūta,[2] an anonymous work consisting in three scenes, depicts the incident of Kriṣṇa's mission to Duryodhana on behalf of Yudhiṣṭhira. Lüders considers this to be an imitation of Dūtāṅgada and on the analogy brands it in the class of the chāyānāṭaka. But the story has a close parallelism with that of the Dūtavākya of Bhāsa, and characteristically no way different from an ordinary drama. But Pischel doubts whether it can be included in the category of the chāyānāṭaka. Similar is the case with Ānandalatikā,[3] composed by Kṛṣṇanātha Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya, son of Durgādās Cakravartin. Eggeling gives an estimation of it in the following words: "Though exhibiting some of the forms of nāṭaka (and marked as such outside), the work is devoid of all real dramatic action, being rather a collection of poetry, descriptive and narrative, with interspersed dialogues and quasi stage directions." The drama has five sections called Kusumas on the love of Sama (Soma?) and Revā. Rājendralāla Mitra refers to a Chāyānāṭaka by Viṭṭala which is "an outline of a drama founded on the history of the Adil Śāhī dynasty."[4] But we know nothing more about the work. Kṛṣṇamācāriār in his History of Classical Sanskrit Literature discusses a little about the Chāyanāṭaka but nothing conclusive follows from it. He gives the text of a work called Traivikramam which is interesting for its peculiar construction being a representation of several scenes depicting the incident of the Dwarf incarnation of Viṣṇu, the description of which is being given by the Sūtradhāra to Naṭi. The scenes are so many pictures produced

---

1 Bendall in J. R. A. S., 1898, p. 231.

2 Bendall, Catalogue of MSS in the British Museum, no. 270, p. 106. Lèvi, op. cit. p. 242.

3 Eggeling, op. cit, vii, p. 1624, no. 4208 (248).

4 Bikaner catalogue, p. 251.

on a screen but by what method is not easily intelligible. Nowhere in the work it is called a chāyānāṭaka.[1]

The most important of the chāyānāṭakas is, of course, Dūtāṅgada[2] of Subhaṭa, which styles itself as a chāyānāṭaka and which has been taken as a typical specimen by the exponents of the shadow-play theory. The name of king Tribhuvanapāla, most probably the Calukyan prince of that name ruling over Aṇahilla-paṭṭaka or Aṇhilvād in Guzrāt at about 1242-43 A. D. is associated with the production of the play.

The drama was staged at a Spring Festival in the memory of Kumārapāla, the dead prince of the dynasty. Kumārapāla's restoration of the Śaiva temple of Devapaṭṭana or Somanātha was the incident commemorated. It was the dol or the holi festival[3] occuring in the month of Phālguna (March-April) when the performance took place. Dūtāṅgada is a short composition of four scenes describing the theme of Act VII of the Mahānāṭaka (Madhusūdana's version), viz, Aṅgada's mission to Rāvaṇa demanding restoration of Sītā. The work has both a shorter as well as a longer recension. The shorter one has been published by the Bombay Kāvyamālā series no. 28, 1891 (new edition, 1922) while the longer one lies in manuscript form in the India Office. Eggeling[4] describes it in the following ways :—"Not only in the dialogue itself considerably extended in this version by the insertion of many additional stanzas, but narrative verses are also thrown in, calculated to make this work a curious hybrid between a dramatic piece (with stage directions) and a narrative poem. This latter character of the composition is still more pronounced by an introduction of thirty-nine stanzas in mixed metres (partly however, placed in the mouths of Rāma and Hanumat) refering to incidents which lead to the discovery of Sītā's hiding

---

1 Kṛṣṇamācāriār—History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, pp. 685-691

2 See Bendall in J R A S. 1898, pp 229-30, also his catalogue of Skt. Mss. in the British Museum, no. 269 pp. 105-6 and Gray in JAOS, xxxii 58-9. Analysis of the play given by Wilson, Select Specimens, Appendix 1 pp. 81-82 and Aufrecht. Bodleian Catalogue, p. 189 shorter recensions), Eng. trs. (shorter recensions) in Gray, op. cit. pp. 68-77, also Eggeling, op. cit., vii, no. 4189.

3 'यात्रायां दोलपर्वणि'

4 Eggeling, op. cit. vii, no. 4189

place." As most of the supplementary verses are taken from comparatively late Rāma-dramas this recension is considered to be of later origin.

Pischel was the first man to call our attention to the similarity between the Dūtāṅgada and the Mahānāṭaka in their mod eof constrution. It may be recalled here that the Mahānāṭaka is considered by some as another specimen of a chāyānāṭaka though neither in the prologue nor in the colophon it is styled as such. Not even from the study of the whole of the drama a single clue is to be found to classify it as a chāyānāṭaka. The drama, though accepted as a regular nāṭaka by the later rhetoricians, is admittedly to be somewhat peculiar in the construction. And this peculiarity probably led scholars to brand it as a chāyānāṭaka on the analogy of Dūtāṅgada.

Now, though it is very difficult to identify the chāyānāṭaka with the shadow-play yet we must admit that these compositions were irregular ones and were not recognised even by the later rhetoricians. These may be popular varieties of the classical types. It is interesting to note here that these dramas were performed during certain festivals as is to be known from the Dharmābhyudaya and Dūtāṅgada,—'yātrotsava' and 'yatrāyām dolapārvaṇi' respectively. These may be puppet shows composed for the special occasion from the too well-known incidents of the classical literature. The term 'yātrā' in this connection is not to be overlooked altogether. A popular performance bearing the above title is still prevalent in Bengal. They were certainly performed during festive days as is still done and this may explain the reason behind in adopting this peculiar name. Kṛṣṇanātha Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya's Ānandalatikā though not accepted as a shadow-play as it lacks any reference to that, is certainly an irregular type of drama, a dramatic poem to be really called, and may be taken as one of the earliest specimen of a Bengali yātrā. Similar is the case with Jayadeva's Gītagovinda. Whatever may be the argument in calling it a lyrical composition or a collection of songs, there is no doubt that it used to have been performed on festive occasions. Though our present Bengali yātrās are in no way different from the theatrical compositions, for which the influence of the latter is solely responsible, yet if we find the early specimens of them we may be surprised by the close similarity of them with the compositions mentioned above.

Now whatever may be the real nature of a chāyānāṭaka we must put

forward a satisfactory explanation of the term 'chāyā' while discarding its identity with 'shadow'. The term chāyā may mean here 'resemblance', — resemblance to a big drama or 'the outline of a drama'. The author of Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakoṣa gives the meaning of the term chāyā as 'chāyā kathāsāmyam'.[1] According to Dr S. K. De[2] — "it is possible also to suggest that it was a chāyā or adaptation of existing works on the subject for a particular purpose." This surmise of Dr. De finds strong support from the following facts. Dūtāṅgada, the most important specimen of the chāyānāṭaka, as has been published from the Bombay Kāvyamālā series, is of a shorter recension and we are informed that a longer recension of the work is preserved in the India Office Library. Similarly the story of king Daśārṇabhadra, depicted in Dharmābhyudaya, might have been taken from an early earlier work. According to Weber's (Index) Verzeichnis (11, p. 102), Merutuṅga deals with the legend of Daśārṇabhadra in the fourth Book of his Mahāpuruṣacaritam, and Hemacandra's Pariśiṣṭaparva (XI, verse 124f) refers to the same as previously known. Same is the case with the Māhanāṭaka (of course, if we are prepared to accept it as a chāyānāṭaka). For the two different recensions of the work vary in shape and contents and the compilers are different personalities. A legend ascribes the authorship of the drama to one Hanumān who threw his work in the sea apprehending Vālmīki's displeasure. The work was later rescued by king Vikramāditya and given its present shape.

This is all about other published chāyānāṭakas. But our one is singular in its character as well as in plot. It begins with a regular Nāndī, ends in a Bharatavākya uttered by the hero and has stage directions, though not regular. Usual prose passages occur, with verses, altogether seventy-four in number, too much for a short composition like this. Sanskrit is the language, even spoken by the females, and only in one instance Prākṛta has been used and without any reason. It is in no way different from a regular one act play save and except the designation assumed in the colophon :— iti Śrī Vyāsalaghukaviviracitam Vṛttivallabham nāma chāyānāṭakam samāptam.

---

1 'छाया कथासाम्यम्' -- Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakoṣa of Sāgaranandin, Ed. by Myles Dillon. Vol I., p. 7.

2. op. cit., pp. 551.

The story though historical is used as an allegory and here it differs from all other chāyānāṭakas. The play was performed before the audience of the ruler Mahīmūda Śaha, but we are not informed of the occasion of this performance. It is hardly intelligible why allegory was used as a medium in narrating a historical incident. Was it for the presence of the ruler whose qualities were to be sung in the theme ? Allegory is not uncommon in Indian literature. From the days of Aśvaghoṣa we possess testimony to this type of literary pursuits. But it is certainly interesting to find a work of this type using allegory in its representation. Throughout the drama there is nothing to show that it was even used as a shadow-play.

The name of the author, as told before, is Vyāsalaghukavi, as given in the colophon. The peculiarity of the name may suggest that it was the nom-de-plume and not the real-name of the author. Nothing more is to be known about the author save in one or two instances he makes pun on his own name. From the incident depicted in the drama we may surmise that the author probably had utilised the story of his own life as the subject matter. Vṛttivallabha, the hero of the play, in that case may represent our author in disguise. Though the workmanship of the drama is nothing extraordinary, the author spares no pains in the estimation of his merit. For in the colophon he remarks about his bitter critics in the following way :— "It is no credit to blame the cloud, worthy of turning the earth into an ocean, if a cātaka is deprived from having a fall of a drop of water on the fold of its beaks."[1] and afterwards in a really artistic way :—"The sandal endures patiently the severe stroke of an axe and even grinding only with the desire to be besmeared on the breast of the lotus-eyed (i. e., the beautiful damsels)." A few Udbhaṭa verses also have been quoted by him to strengthen his remark. For example : "The cuckoo does not boast (even) of drinking the celestial mango-juice ; while the frog makes an ugly sound drinking muddy water."[2]

---

1 चातकस्य मुखचञ्चुसम्पुटे नो पतन्ति यदि वारिबिन्दवः ।
सागरीकृतमहीतलस्य किं दोष एव जलदस्य दीयते ॥७ Colophon

2 दिव्यं चूतरसं पीत्वा न गर्वं याति कोकिलः ।
पीत्वा कर्दमपानीयं भेको भकभकायते ॥६

And, "A man without legs goes a far distance ; a man, though he knows the letters, is not a learned one. And a dumb (is) an expert orator (or speaks Sanskrit), and the ocean devoid of water."[1]

Leaving this much information about our author we pass on to the other factors of the drama. About the date of the composition of our drama we have mainly to depend, as narrated before, on internal evidences. The amount of historical data furnished by the author in his work, though not of great importance, is certainly interesting.[2] But it is put in such a confused way that one finds himself, after a good deal of searching, lost in the labyrinth of genealogical conflicts. The whole responsibility may not lie only on the poor author because the genealogy of the provincial muslim rulers is highly infested with the same nomenclature and in such a way that a ruler of a certain province may sometimes be identified with that of another or the grandfather is mistaken for the grandson and vice versa. Our author may be accused in this regard that how he, being the contemporary of the ruling sovereign, whose audience is clearly referred at the beginning of the work, can put things in such a way as to make the identity impossible. It is no wonder that the Indian poets spend the last drop of their poetic genius in wholesome praises about their benefactors however insignificant they may be. But to exhault a local ruler, if the identification be correct, as the ruler of the whole world, or the paramount severign, is certainly going far away from the bonds of exaggeration. Much labour is lost, thereby in vain and unnecessary wastage of time leads to nothing but uncertainty. However, here we are putting all the propositions on the table and it behoves a laborious researcher of history to find out the truth from them.

In the opening verse of the drama which may be technically called the Nāndi, one Mahīmūda Śāha is praised as a great ruler[3] instead of a god or a goddess as the convention requires. The poet further

---

1 अपदो दूरगामी च साक्षरो न च पण्डितः ।
मौनी संस्कृतवक्ता च समुद्रो वारिवर्जितः ॥१

2. For this chapter I have consulted Cambridge History of India vol. III chapters XIII & XIV and Tabaquāt-I-Akbarī — vol iii translated into Eng. by Brajendranath De and Baini Prasad.

3 जीयात् श्रीमहिमूदशाहनृपतिर्दैवस्य दैवं महत् ॥

informs in the Prastāvanā that he is a paramount sovereign and the son of one Gyāsadīna who assumed the title Zarabax for his lavish gifts.[1] This Gyāsadīna also was a paramount sovereign. From this description one naturally feels tempted to identify this Mahīmūda Śāha as the famous ruler Mahammad Śāh of Delhi. Mahmmad Śāh was the son of Giasuddīn Tughluk. This identification finds strong support from the other expressions exchanged between the Naṭi and the Sūtradhāra viz.—

Naṭi—My lord, is this he, even at the expression of whose false anger the hearts of the rulers of the world, who are no different from Indra on the earth, become worried with the fear of bursting out ?

Sūtradhāra—What else ? It is he, the paramount sovereign, the fire, as if, in the forest of enemy kings.[2]

And again the Naṭi remarks :— He being pleased, enemies become servants, while indifferent friends turn into foes.[3]

This certainly encourages a casual reader to take the identity as certain. Mahmmad Śāh of Delhi was notorious for his caprices and rightly Sūtradhāra remarks :— Again, listen to this ruler's whim, for "In order to distinguish the Hindoos the king's legal authorities have ordered the tail of the turban to be tinged with the juice of kiṁśuka flower."[4]

So far we were satisfied with the above identification. But other factors which crop up in the text proper cannot be reconciled with this identification and thereby create new problems. For the hero when addresses this great ruler as "the Lord of Guzrāt"[5] We wonder

---

1 .....सुवर्णदानार्जित जरबक्सविरुदस्य पातसाहशिरोमणेः श्रीग्यासदीनस्यांगजः ।

2 नटी—स्वामिन् यस्मिन् कृतकपटकोपाटोपेऽपि महीमन्डलाखण्डलप्रतिमानामपि पृथिवीभूजां हृदयानि स्फोटातङ्क शङ्कुलव्याकुलानि जायन्ते स एवायम् ।

सूत्रधारः—किमन्यत् । स एवायं रिपुराजन्यदावपावक पातशाह शिरोमणिः ।

3 यस्मिन् प्रसन्ने रिपवोऽपि दासा
मित्रान्यमित्राणि भवन्त्युदासे ।

4 पुनः कौतुकमिदं महीपतेः समाकर्णय ।.....हिन्दुजनानामुपलक्षणाय राज्ञो धर्माधिकारिभिरादिष्टा किंशुकरसरज्यमानोष्णीष परम्परा प्रान्तरचना ।

5 गुर्जरपतिः ।

whether the great Sultan could be addressed as a local ruler. One might explain the expression in this way : In all probablity a rural poet might not have gone out of his country to realise that Mahammad Śāh was not merely the ruler of Guzrāt but the emperor of Delhi as well. This is not the only one instance, there are others too.

If the above said Mahīmūda Śāh be identified with the great ruler of Delhi the first question that may be raised is whether we can equate the term Mahīmūda with Mahammad instead of Māmud. Secondly nowhere in the drama Delhi or the dynastic appelation Tughluk find any place. Thirdly though it is certain that Mahammad Tughluk passed a good deal of years in the vicinity of Guzrāt yet as he was always busy in suppressing rebellions he had hardly any time to enjoy a dramatic performance. Fourthly, then Gyāsadīna, described in the drama as a ruler of Mālwā, must be taken to be a quite different person from the father of the famous ruler of Delhi, and subordinate to Mahammad Tughluk. But this goes against history. And we are to consider seriously whether a local ruler had the audacity to offer shelter to the hero of the drama who became an object of disregard by the great Sultan, Mahammad Śāh.

The second choice may fall on Māmud Śāh Begarha, the most notable ruler of Guzrāt who ruled peacefully and with prosperity over that province for a long period. From the description and incidents narrated in the drama, Mahīmūda Śāh with all certainty, was a ruler of Guzrāt. If we identify him with Māmud Śāh Begarha as mentioned above, we again face genealogical absurdity. For no person was known as Gyāsuddin to be the father of Māmud Śāh Begarha. This trouble must have been caused by the poet from a confusion arising out of the similarity of names of the two parallel ruling Houses of Guzrāt and Mālwā. The two Houses of Guzrāt and Mālwā ruled independently from 1396 to 1572 A. D. and from 1392 to 1561 A. D. respectively. In the family of Mālwā Gyāsuddin was a famous ruler and he was renowned for his lavish gifts. But neither his son was Māmud Śāh, nor he held sway over the province of Guzrāt. His son was Sultan Nasiruddin Abdul Kādir. Gyāsuddin's grandson was, no doubt, called Sultan Māhmūd. But the meaning of the term Aṅgaja (son, and certainly not grandson) and the epithet Gurjarapati (lord of Gurjara) goes against identifying him as our ruler.

Now Gyāsuddin of Mālwā (1469-1500) was a contemporary of Māmud Begarha (1458-1511 A. D.) for several years. If we identify

our Gyāsadina and Mahīmuda Śāh with them respectively we can explain the incidents of the drama to a certain degree of satisfaction. But the genealogical problem remains unsolved. So we leave this matter to the students of history who may do justice in identifying the real person. In any case, it is certain that the drama was composed between the 14th and the 16th centuries of the christian era.

The drama is an allegory as will be seen from the names of the actors and actresses used in the drama, viz., Vṛttivallabha, Anarthanidhi, Vṛtti, Pratiṣṭhā, Sevā, Lajjā, Kīrti, etc, and reminds one of the famous Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamiśra. Here we narrate the story of the drama in a nutshell. Vṛttivallabha, the hero of the drama is deprived of his fortune by the enraged ruler of Guzrāt, Mahīmuda Śāha, and so he intends to leave his country, Gurjaradeśa, in disguise as a mendicant for Benares. Vṛtti his lady-love has forsaken him and gone away. Vṛttivallabha entreats his companion Anarthanidhi to appease her on his behalf and narrate his (hero's) pitiable condition through her separation. Anarthanidhi unwillingly goes out but returns with the report that she is enjoying other's companionship and pays on heed to his appeal. Vṛttivallabha does not believe this and explains Vṛtti's conduct as an outcome of the sufferings of separation. Vṛtti, at this moment, enters the stage and rebukes Vṛttivallabha for his entreaties and reminds him of the fact that not many a person more qualified than him could have been her overlord for a considerable period. Vṛttivallabha is disappointed, rebukes her as unchaste but to no gain. He then requests her (Vṛtti's) friend Pratiṣṭhā to be his companion. Vṛtti disappears in disdain. Pratiṣṭhā complains about his indifferent attitude towards her in appeasing Vṛtti. Vṛttivallabha assures and begs pardon for that. Pratiṣṭhā advises him to proceed to Benares with her friend Kalā and herself. But Vṛttivallabha finds no peace without taking any revenege for the insult inflicted by Vṛtti upon him. Pratiṣṭhā opines that with the help of Kalā he will certainly be able to attain fortunes from other kings. But Vṛttivallabha declines to appease other rulers save Mahīmūda Śāha who once bestowed on him immense fortune. Otherwise, he must proceed to Benares in the guise of a mendicant and praise only the lord of the universe. Incidentally here Vṛttivallabha enquires about Kīrti. Kalā informs that on her way from Pṛṣṭhapura she (Kīrti) will be there to invite the scholars at the court

of Mālwā. (This Kīrti is described as the consort of Gyāsadīna, ruler of Mālwā) Kīrti then enters and assures Vṛttivallabha of her help in becoming the master of immense riches and an object of adoration to other kings. Vṛttivallabha when about to leave his country feels grieved for the long association with it and naturally hesitates. At the moment Lajjā with Āśā appears and rebukes him for this act of ingratitude. Vṛttivallabha narrates his helpless condition. He has no other alternative but to leave the country as his fortune is gone, he has to carry on his head a piece of yellow cloth and more over, he has been insulted in various ways in the court of the king. Lajjā informs him that the king is not really angry, but he adopted this measure in order to teach a lesson to the people. Lajjā requests Āśā to console Vṛttivallabha. Āśā consoles him saying that the king's character is full of contrasts and so this act of disregard should not be taken into consideration seriously. She advises him to attain the king with his service, entreat the ministers, and touch the feet of the justice ; otherwise without any material assistance he will not be able to proceed to Benares. Vṛttivallabha agrees but finds it difficult to approach the king in this state of affairs. Āśā says that she will ask her friend Karuṇā to lay his prayer before the king. Vṛttivallabha being hopeful wishes to report his desire to the king through Karuṇā in the following way : The king had once enriched him with immeasurable wealth and honour for his credit in composing several dramas and prose pieces, but now when he (the king) has deprived him of his fortune, is he to approach another king like a beggar ? Āśā brings Karuṇā on the stage and informs Vṛttivallabha that as his desire is going to be fulfilled, he should no more worry or contemplate upon leaving the country. The king will return everything through Rājasevā which have been previously taken away from him. Rājasevā enters at this moment and rejoices that it is fortunate enough that the king returns all to Vṛttivallabha and now he should protect his subjects remaining under the merciful protection of the king. Here ends the plot followed by the conventional Bharatavākya.

Karuṇā—Vṛttivallabha, what good else can I render to you ?

Vṛttivallabha—What else can remain good to me ? Still, let it be—(performed)—

Let the earth fulfill the desires of the people, the clouds be bountiful, the rulers protect their subjects like sons. Let the desire of the

wicked perish, on the earth always the wishes of the good (only) be fulfilled, (and) let compassion prevail in the mind of the rulers as long as the moon and the stars exist.

(Here ends the chāyānaṭaka, Vṛttivallabha composed by Śrīvyāsa laghukavi).[1]

---

1 करुणा—वृत्तिवल्लभ किं ते भूयः प्रियमुपकरोमि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अतःपरं किं मे प्रियमस्ति । तथापीदमस्तु—

लोकानां वाञ्छितार्थं वितरतु वसुधा कामवर्षं पयोदाः
कुर्वन्तु क्षोणिपालाः सुतमिव सततं स्वप्रजां पालयन्तु ।
दुष्टानामिष्टनाशो भवतु भुवि सदा सज्जनानामभीष्टं
भूयादाचन्द्रतारं निवसतु करुणा मानसे भूमिपानाम् ॥१४

इति व्यासलघुकविविरचितं वृत्तिवल्लभं नाम छायानाटकं समाप्तम् । श्रीः ॥

श्रीव्यासलघुकविविरचितं
वृत्तिवल्लभं

नाम छायानाटकम्

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

द्वारे मत्तगजोत्कराः परिचराः प्रत्यर्थिपृथ्वी[1] भुजो
लीला [2]मन्दिरकिङ्करीव कुरुते कार्याणि सर्वाण्यपि ।
छायावत्कमलापि नोज्झति पदं यत्सेवकाणामसौ
जीयात् श्रीमहिमूदशाहनृपतिर्दैवस्य दैवं महत् ॥१

नान्द्यन्ते सूत्रधारः

आः प्रिये यः सकलजगत्परिपालनाय समादिष्टः परमपुरुषेण महीमवतीर्णो महेन्द्र इव भुवनजनमनोमनोपूरपूरणाय पौरुषमाश्रितः कल्पतरुरिव असाधारण-सौन्दर्येण द्वितीयभावमापन्नोऽश्विनीकुमार इव चम्पककर्पूरगौराकृतिं भजमानः साक्षाच्छृङ्गार इव सर्वाङ्गसौन्दर्यं दधानो मूर्तिमान्मदन इव जगज्जनलोचनानन्द-परम्परामातन्वानः कलङ्केनोज्झितः पूर्णेन्दुरिव वितरणगुणविजितविक्रमार्कविस्तारित कर्णवर्णनसुवर्णदानार्जितजरबक्सविरुदस्य पात्साहशिरोमणेः श्रीग्यासदीनस्यांगजः श्रीमहीमुदशाह पृथिवीपतिः । प्रिये तदिदानोमेतस्य महीपते रूपसौभाग्य-मालोकयन्ती निजनेत्रयुगं कृतार्थी कुरु ।

नटी—स्वामिन् यस्मिन् कृतकपटकोपाटोपेऽपि[3] महीमण्डलाखण्डल-प्रतिमानामपि पृथिवीभृजां हृदयानि स्फोटातङ्कशङ्कुलव्याकुलानि जायन्ते स एवायम् ।

सूत्रधारः—किमन्यत् । स एवायं रिपुराजन्यदावपावकपातशाहशिरोमणिः ।

---

1. पृथ्वि ।
2. लीलामंदिर.....We have used nasals instead of anusvāra to be found in the manuscript for grammatical reasons.
3. कोपाटोपेपी ।

नटी—तदहमस्येदानीं प्रतापपावकज्वलितपावकप्रतिसामाज्यमाकलयन्ती परमपुरुषमेकमेव याचे।

सूत्रधारः—आः प्रिये किमेवं याचसे ?

नटी—अवधारय स्वामिन्

यस्मिन् प्रसन्ने रिपवोऽपि दासा
मित्राण्यमित्राणि भवन्त्युदासे।
धातः सदा तं कुरु सुप्रसन्नं
दैयोपपन्नं महिमूदशाहम् ॥२

सूत्रधारः—तदेतदस्य रिपुकुलकालाग्नेः कोपानुभवः कुतस्ते कलावत्-कामिन्याः ? या त्वं सकरुणारसमानसाश्रुधारा कलितलोचना सगद्गदकण्ठा जगदीश्वरमेवमभ्यर्थयसे ?

नटी—स्वामिन् एतदखिलं करुणाकारणमिहागतो वृत्तिवल्लभ एव निवेदयिष्यति। पुनरहं स्त्रीस्वभावभीरुर्न निगदितुं पारयामि।

ततो नेपथ्ये वृत्तिवल्लभः।

सूत्रधारः (नटीं प्रति)—आर्ये अयमागतो वृत्तिवल्लभः। तदावामितः सन्देहगतौ कौतुकं पश्यावः।

ततः प्रविशति वृत्तिवल्लभः पीताम्बरखण्डमण्डितशिराः
सेवकेनानर्थनिधिना समम्।

नटी (तमालोक्य)—अहो अस्य महीमघवतः सौभाग्यम्। यन्नगर-मधिवसन्तो जनाः किंशुकरसरज्यमानोष्णीषपरम्परामभिवहन्तो निरन्तरवसन्त-महोत्सवाननुभवन्तो[1] लक्ष्यन्ते। किंच

कुङ्कुमारुणितमौलिवेष्टना उत्सुकारथ परम्पराश्रिताः।
हिन्दवो नवविहारमङ्गलाः सर्वतोऽपि विहरन्ति साम्प्रतम् ॥३॥

सूत्रधारः—प्रिये नेयं वसन्तमहोत्सवारुणता। किन्तु हिन्दुजनानामुप-

1. अनुभवं ते लक्ष्यन्ते।

लक्षणाय राज्ञो धर्माधिकारिभिरादिष्टा किंशुकरसरञ्यमानोष्णीषपरम्परा प्रान्त-रचना।

नटी—स्वामिन्नेषा निजवेषविशेषोपलक्षितानामप्येतत् पूर्वपरागतादधिकमिव प्रतिभाति।

सूत्रधारः—सत्यं प्रिये। पुनः कौतुकमिदं महीपतेः समाकर्णय

नानावर्णविशेषवेषरचना भिन्नेव यल्लक्ष्यते
तत्पीताम्बरखण्डमण्डितमिदं राज्ञा किमाज्ञापितम्।
नैतत्वंशपरम्परागतमहो राज्ञोऽपि नाज्ञाजुषाम्
नान्यस्मिन्नपि पातशाहविषये तत् कौतुकं भूपतेः ॥४

अलमलमनया राजकथया। वृत्तिवल्लभं पश्यावः।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—(अनर्थनिधिं प्रति) अनर्थनिधे समाकर्णय

या सीमा सुखसम्पदां समुदयस्थानं निदानं श्रियां
या संसारविहारसारसरसी प्राणाधिका प्रेयसी।
या लीलाकृतकौतुकेन कुपिता कल्पान्तकालायते
सा वृत्तिर्वनितामास्तु विमुखा कस्यापि हास्यादपि ॥५

अनर्थनिधिः—स्वामिन् सत्यमेव। कथमस्याः सौभाग्यपरम्परां वर्णयामि।

एषा भाग्यपरम्परां विदधती भर्तुः श्रियं सर्वतो
यच्छन्ती सुकृतौघसाधनपरा नानागुणग्रामभूः।
पुष्यन्ती[1] प्रतिवासरं नव नव कामान् मनः कामितान्
वृत्तिर्भाग्यवतां गृहे विलसति प्राणप्रिये चापरा ॥६

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अनर्थनिधे यदहमेतादृशान् विभावाननुभवामि तदेतस्याः सानुकूलायाः फलं कलय—

सुधाधौतावासाः सरसयुवतीनां शतमितः
सहस्रं भृत्यानां निवसति गृहद्वारमभितः।
हयाः संख्यातीता धनमपि च वाञ्छाधिकतरं
नृणां दाने शक्तिः सकलमपि वृत्तेर्विलसितम् ॥७

---

1. पुष्णन्ती ?

तदेनां कारणमन्तरेण कुपितां प्राणप्रियां यथाकथञ्चिदनुनय ।

ततोऽनर्थनिधिरितस्ततः विलोक्य वृत्तिवल्लभं प्रति—स्वामिन्नयमस्या अभिप्रायः । सा भवत् सकाशात् कोपेन गतेव प्रतिभाति ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—तर्हि तत्सखीं प्रतिष्ठामाकारय ।

अनर्थनिधिः प्रतिष्ठे इत्याहूय स्वामिनं प्रति—प्रतिष्ठापि तया सह गतैव प्रतिभाति ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—शिव शिव प्रतिष्ठापि गता ।

मनो हृत्वा वृत्तिर्मम नवगुणग्रामविभवैः
स्वयं मानिन्युच्चैर्मदविनयतः प्रेमकुपिता ।
इयं लीलालोला क्वचिदपि गता मां कलयितुं
प्रतिष्ठा पापिष्ठा पुनरनुगतैनां कथमहो ॥८

अनर्थनिधिः—सर्वथेयं मम प्रमाणं कलयितुमिति ।

[वृत्तिवल्लभः][1] —एषात्मनो निरोधाय [2]क्वचिदपिकारणा[3] न्निर्गता स्वभावतो मद्विरहभीरुरिति मामन्तरेण स्थातुमशक्ता विरहवेदनामनुभवन्ती प्रायः कृशाङ्गीभूता ममानुनयमात्रमिच्छन्ती नितरां क्षीणा भविष्यति । तथाहि । सम्प्रति तद्विरह-दशामनुभवतो मे वृत्तान्तं पुरो निवेद्य तद्विरहजातमखिलमाकलय्य सत्वरं समेहि ।

अनर्थनिधिः—प्रमाणमिति निष्क्रम्येतस्ततो गत्वा—स्वामिन् श्रीमद्विरह-जातमखिलं निवेदितम् । पुनरनया मामप्यनुपलक्ष्यमाणया क्षणं कर्णयोरपि चाधारि । कोऽसौ वृत्तिवल्लभ इति सन्देहदोलान्दोलितोऽपि नः[4] स्वामी ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अनर्थनिधे तत्प्रायोविरहविवशा भवितुमर्हति ।

अनर्थनिधिः—सत्यं स्वामिन् । किं ब्रूमस्तस्या विरहदशाम् ।

उन्मत्ता करिणीव पूर्वतनुतस्त्रैगुण्यमातन्वती
शृङ्गारध्वजतोरणादिभिरलं संभूषिता सर्वतः ।

---

1. Restored by us.
2. कचिदपि.....
3. कारणान्तर्गता.....
4. न ।

कृत्वा स्वं च नवं विवाहमधुना भर्त्रा समं खेलती
स्वामिस्त्वद्विरहेण वृत्तिवनिता धत्ते दशामीदृशीम्[1] ॥९

तदनुवृत्तिवल्लभः श्रावं श्रावं शिरोऽवधूय—अनर्थनिधे तदहं चिरतरानुराग-लीलामुद्भावयन्नेकवारमेनामनुनयामि ।

अनर्थनिधिः—को निवारयति । कथं नानुनयसि । समयज्ञोऽसि । अयमेवानुनयावसरः ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः (वृत्तेः करमलम्ब्य)—

वृत्ते कारणमन्तरेण कुपिता किं मां विहायाधुना
जीवन्तं बत नायकान्तरगृहं गन्तुं समुत्कण्ठिता ।
आः किं पापिनि लज्जसे न सहसा वेश्या विटे पञ्चतां
प्राप्ते पञ्चदिनान्यपि प्रणयतो वैधव्यदुःखं वहेत् ॥१०

अनर्थनिधिः—एकोए पाणिग्गहण कुणई उण एसो निलज्जोपायं न मुञ्चदि । सा[2] ऊचितीए जीविदं । रते पियेविवत्ता[3] उहमाणिं । ऐधणजीवितं वित्ते । एसो विरत्तरत्तो हे अन्धो वित्तिवल्लहो सच्चं । अहो हे अन्धो वित्तिवल्लहो अच्छरियं । अहो एसो अणवल्लहकुणए उण एसो णिल्लज्जो चाटडकोडिं कुव्वाणो एणामणुणेहि इत्युच्चैर्हसति ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—(सभ्रूभङ्गमनर्थं वारयन् पुनर्वृत्तिं प्रति)—

रे वृत्ते व्यभिचारिणि प्रणयिनं मां चाटुकोटिं सदा
कुर्वाणं यदुपेक्षसेऽप्यविनये चापल्यमुच्चैस्तव ।
दुष्टे नो हृदि लज्जसे प्रियतमे रक्ते विरक्ता सती
सन्धानं कुरुषे परेण तदहो स्त्रीणां सतीत्वं वृथा ॥११

वृत्तिः—आः कपटकान्त मम स्वभावं जानन्नपि अज्ञ इव चाटुकोटिं कुर्वन् किं वृथा शोचसि । कस्त्वं वराकः । शृणु मुग्ध—

भुक्त्वा मां शतशो गता नृपसुताः केनापि नाहं गता
भुञ्जानानपि नो विहाय नृपतीन् कांस्कानहं कामये ।

---

1. ...मीदृशिं ।
2. साहुचितीए... ।
3. Restored by us.

जानन्तोऽपि महीभुजो ममकृते प्राणांस्त्यजन्तीह ये
तद्वृत्तास्थिरवृत्तिलेशविरहात्[1] किं मूढ़ संखिद्यसे ॥१२

वृत्तिवल्लभः—आः पापिष्ठे यथेष्टं याहि। सम्प्रत्यव[2] वगतं ते स्वरूपम्।

मानम्लानमुखी यदासि कठिने वृत्ते तदानीं मया
कृत्वा चाटुशतानि मानिनि महाकष्टैः प्रसन्नीकृता।
संभूय व्यभिचारिणीव सपदि स्वाम्यन्तरं काङ्क्षतो
तत्त्वं याहि यथेच्छया पुनरियं कान्ता प्रतिष्ठास्तु मे ॥१३

वृत्तिः—(सरोषं पाणिं मुञ्चयन्ती)—याहि प्रतिष्ठामेवाभुक्ष्व। का वारयति।

क्रयक्रीतेव दासीयं सदा मदनुवर्त्तिनी।
मया त्यक्तस्य कस्यापि प्रतिष्ठास्ति पतिव्रता ॥१४

वृत्तिवल्लभः—तत् किं त्वां तृणवन्मन्यमानां भर्तृहरिप्रमुखानां प्रतिष्ठा नासीत् यत्वमीदृग्गर्वसि। शृणु दुराचारे वृत्ते।

वृत्तिः—वद कपट कान्त।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—प्रणयिता तव ज्ञाता।

वृत्तिः—तत् किं सपदि परिणीतास्मीह भवता।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—न किं ते भर्ताहम्।

वृत्तिः—तदधिकगुणाः केऽपि न पुमांसो ममाभूवन्नीशाः।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहह कुलटे मुद्रय मुखम् ॥१५।

ततो लब्धा[3] वसरो वृत्तिवल्लभः प्रतिष्ठां प्रति—आकर्णयाकर्णय लोचने (?) प्रतिष्ठे। वयमस्यास्त्वां प्राणप्रियां सखीमिव मन्यामहे। पुनरियमविनयवती वृत्तिस्त्वां धनक्रीतां दासीमिवमन्यते। तदेतस्याः कथमपि दृढ़तराभिमानग्रन्थि-मुन्मोचय। यथासौ जानाति कस्याः कानुचरी। पुनर्वयमपि जानीमः—

वृथा कथा जनानां यत् प्रतिष्ठा वृत्ति किंकरी।
प्रतिष्ठाधिष्ठितान्मन्ये वृत्तिर्दासी वने वने ॥१६॥

---

1. ...लेशविरहा किं।
2. संप्रत्यवागतं।
3. लब्धावसवो।

आकर्णय प्रतिष्ठे सम्प्रति वृत्तिविरक्तं निरवलम्बं सनाथमप्यनाथमिव मां समुद्धर जगत्परिहासपातकाम्भोधेः (इति प्रतिष्ठां स्वकरेण करावलम्बनं कारयति ।)

प्रतिष्ठा—आकलय स्वामिन् । किं ब्रूमस्त्वां यदनयामोहितमानसस्त्वमन्यमहिमानं न वेत्सि । पुनरद्याप्यवहित्थां कुर्वंस्त्वामेव सापराधामन्तःस्मरन् स्वमिव मामेव परिहासपात्रं विधातुमुद्यतोऽसि । यन्मामङ्गीकुरुष्वेति चिरमवज्ञाता कलाप्रियसखीं मामधुना विप्रतारयसि । यदस्माकमचिराद्वृत्तेः प्रथमत एव गतसौभाग्यायाः पुनरहमन्यथातदनुनयलालसमानसं त्वामनुसरन्ती कलास्वामिन्याः पुरो न सौभाग्यभाजनं भवामि । पुनराकर्णय यथामोहित[1] त्वत्स्वरूपम् ।

पात्रं सन्तापकोटेः परिभवभवनं यात्रसेवा नृणां वै
वृत्तिर्दासी तदीयापुनरखिलजगद्भुक्तमुक्तान्यसक्ता ।
या निष्काश्य स्वयं तामनुनयसि महामूढ़चाटुनिकृत्वा
धत्से खेदं न चित्त पुनरभिलषसि स्वां प्रतिष्ठां [2]विधातुम् ॥१७

वृत्तिवल्लभः—आः कथमिच्छेति निष्ठुराक्षरं भाषसे भवति । कथं कलास्वामिन्याः पुरो हि न सौभाग्यभाजनं भवती ।

कलासख्यपि सन्तुष्टा तिष्ठन्त्यां त्वयि तिष्ठति ।
अविनाभावसम्बन्धो भवत्योरस्ति शाश्वतः ॥१८

पुनर्निरन्तरान्तःकृतस्नेहभावमजानती मामिह विहाय वृत्तेः प्रथमत एव गन्तुमुद्यता ।

प्रतिष्ठा—एवमेव । अनेकवनितावल्लभस्य ते मनोगताधिकस्नेहमजानत्यपि विषीदामि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहो सकलचातुर्यपरम्परापारं गतात्रभवती । मन्मानसान्तर्गतस्नेहं सत्यपि न जानते । तन्मे गृहवैषम्यं शृणु ।

बलादाकृषोच्चैः सकलमपिवृत्तेर्वसु मया
प्रतिष्ठे त्वत्युष्ट्यै[3] व्ययितमितियत्त्वं न चपला ।

---

1. मोहितस्त्वत् ।
2. धातुम् ।
3. तत्पुष्ट्यै ।

प्रतिष्ठा—(स्वामिनं प्रति)—किङ्कर्या मया किं करणीयम् (इत्यञ्जलिं बध्नाति ।)

वृत्तिवल्लभः—देवि प्रतिष्ठे यथाकथञ्चिदिदानीं स्वामिनमाराध्य स्वकीय-गीतकवित्वापत्यपरिवारादि स्वामिनोऽङ्के निधाय काशीनिवासदेशमहमभ्यर्थये । ममेति वासना । त्वया राजदत्तया प्रतिष्ठया यदुचितं तत्करणीयमिति ।

प्रतिष्ठा—तदनेन भूभुजा प्रसादपूर्वं प्रस्थापितस्य ते पुरतश्चरणा किङ्करी प्रतिष्ठाऽग्रेसरी किं किं न चरीकरोमि । पुनरुत्कर्षं वदती त्वत्तो विभेमि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—प्रिये मा भैषीः । स्वशक्त्या ब्रूवाणा मन्मानसमुत्साहय ।

प्रतिष्ठा—यद्यत्त्वां कारयामि तदेकया रसनया वक्तुं न पारयामि । तथाप्याकर्णय—

पृथिवीमवतीर्णस्य द्विजजातेर्यदुचितं हितं नाथ ।
लोकद्वयेऽपि यशसे यत्तत्वां कारयामि किं बहुना ॥३१
नानार्थकृतार्थीकृतदेशान् दर्शयामि त्वाम् ।
तत्तन्नरपतिलीलामाकलयन् सफलय स्वनेत्रयुगम् ॥३२
किमपि कला सुरसालं भूपालं सत्कलाभिराराध्य ।
प्रथय कलासौभाग्यं निजनाथस्यापि कीर्तिमुज्ज्वलय ॥३३
अति चपलायापि वृत्त्या दास्यं ते कारयामि राजकवेः ।
मत्तमहागजयानं दानमपि स्वर्णरत्नतुलनायाः ॥३४

तत्त्वं सत्वरमितः सुमुहूर्तमवलोक्य विविधकलाविलासैर्नानादेशनरेशमानसा-न्युल्लासयन् तत्तन्नरपतिनाट्यशालाकलितकौतुककोटिभिः कृतार्थीकृतनेत्रयुगलः सकलमहीपतीनग्रतः स्वामिकीर्तिं कुर्वन्ननृणीभवन् विश्वेश्वरराजधानीमविवस ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—आः प्रिये प्रतिष्ठे प्रतिष्ठोचितमेव भाषसे । पुनरहं सम्बल-रहितोऽसहायश्चान्यदेशमार्गमजानंस्तत्तद्देशमहीशानां स्वविभवैः सतकारमकुर्वाणो निजमहिमानमतन्वन् कथं काशीं प्राप्नोमीति चिन्ता मे ॥ यतः

राज्ञः श्रीमहिमूदशाहनृपतेर्भिक्षुः पुनर्भूभुजां
सर्वेषामुपकारकृद्गुरुरहं लक्ष्याः लघुः संज्ञया ।
नानादेशमहीपतीन् स्वविभवैः संभाव्य वाराणसीं
नो गच्छामि तदा वृथा मम कथा यद्राजवाञ्छार्थदः ॥३५

तद्वैभवरहितोऽहं नानादेशमहीपतीनां चेतश्चमत्कारिणीं दानमानादिसम्भावनामकुर्वाणः कार्पटिकवेशेन[1] काशीमधिगच्छामीतिवाञ्छा मे।

प्रतिष्ठा—आः स्वामिन् किमेवं मत्प्रतिष्ठाप्रतिकूलं निष्ठुरं भाषसे। यत्त्वं वैभवाभावात् कार्पटिकवेशेन काशीं गन्तुमनाः। यतः—

कश्चित् [2]गुर्जरदेशतो विघटितो वाग्मी कलावान् कवी—
र्योद्धा वापि न भाग्यभाजनमभूद्देशान्तरे नार्चितः।
तत्त्वं राजकविर्विधाय विकृतं वेषं व्रजन् सर्वतोऽ-
प्युच्चैर्मे परिहास्यतां जनयसि स्वस्वामिकीर्तेरपि ॥३६

तदिदानीं सकलविलासैस्सकलमहीभुजामन्तःसन्तोषपरम्परां जनयन् स्वामिकीर्तिलतया परिपूर्तीकृतविभवो मम प्रतिष्ठायाः सुखमुपभुञ्जानः सम्राडिति काशीं किमिति नयामि। यदधुना वैभवविरहेन सकलजगदुपहासकारिकपटकार्पटिकवेषेण गमनमङ्गीकुरुषे।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अविदितप्रतिज्ञा मे मामुत्साहयति देवी।

प्रतिष्ठा—काते प्रतिज्ञा।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—शृणु

अर्वाक्स्वर्णतुलादिकादिह मया कश्चित्कचिद्याचितः
क्षन्तव्यः क्षितिपालमौलिमुकुट प्रौढापराधो मम।
उत्तीर्णोऽयमहं लघुर्यदि तुलाचेलातद्वृत्तं नृपं
याचे तत्कथयामि गुर्जरपते न वस्त्रसूत्रं पुनः ॥३७॥

इति मे प्रतिज्ञा।

प्रतिष्ठा—(सचमत्कारम्)—अहो त्वयागामिवृत्तान्तमजानता महत् प्रतिज्ञातम्।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अये कथमित्थं भाषसे। अयमहमाबाल्यादधिकाधिकक्षुद्रराजराजगुणवर्णनगीतकवित्वकोटिं कुर्वाणोऽप्युदरपूरणमात्रमप्यलभमानः सकलराजराजेन महिमूदमहीभुजा महीभुजामप्यसाध्यतुलापुरुषाद्यनेकदानपरम्परामभ्या-

---

1. वेशेष...।
2. गूर्ज्जर...।

सितः सन् सम्प्रत्येतज्जघन्यान्यराजन्यराज्ञः पुरः करप्रसारं कुर्वन् लघुरहमलघुगौरव-भाजनं न भवामि । इति कृतप्रतिज्ञो विश्वेश्वरमेवाभ्यर्थये । नान्यसामान्य-राजानाम् । यतः—

महिमूदमहीभर्तुर्जगत्कर्तुश्चनान्तरे ।
पुरुषः पृथिवीपीठे किमभ्यर्थयसे लघुः ॥३८॥

प्रिये इतोयं महती मत्प्रतिज्ञा ।

[प्रतिष्ठा][1] —सर्वतः सहस्रधापि वर्धितास्मि वल्लभेन । अहो मे सौभाग्यं प्रतिष्ठायाः । स्वामिन्

त्वामुज्झन्ती वृत्तिस्त्रिगुणीभूता वृथा कथा धनैरेव ।
अनया प्रतिज्ञया मेने शतधा संवर्धिता प्रतिष्ठाऽहम् ॥३९॥

पुनश्च

आबाल्यादधिकाधिकान्नरपतीन् स्तौमि प्रतिज्ञेति ते
स्तुत्वा मा महिमूदशाहमवधिं राज्ञां कृतार्थीकृता ।
एतस्मादधिकः पुराणपुरुषस्तंस्तौषिमुक्त्वापरान्
तत्सर्वं क्षितिपालसंसदि कवे पूर्णा प्रतिष्ठास्मि ते ॥(३९ क)[2]

तदिदानीमेवमेव कर्तव्यम् । यत् कविमतिरप्रतिहतैव ।

न कवेरपरो मन्त्री मतिमान्न कवेः परः ।
अतः पेयं नृपैः काव्यं रचनावचनामृतम् ॥४०॥

यत्त्वया महाकविना निर्णीतं तदुचितमेव । पुनस्त्वं राजकविभिर्विभवाभावाद्विकृत-वेषमभिवहन् सकलराजपरम्परासु हासभाजनं भवसि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—तत् किं करवाणि देवि प्रतिष्ठे । प्रथममेकाकी त्वां प्रतिष्ठा-माच्छादयन्नविदितपरदेशमार्गः कथं गच्छामि । नितराम्बिभेमि ।

---

1. restored by us.
2. verse number is not given.

प्रतिष्ठा—स्वामिन् मा भैषीः। असहायसम्बलचिन्तयालम्[1]। किं नाकर्णि भवता सकलसौभाग्यभूमिकाया मे कलासख्याः महीमघवतः कीर्त्या यत्समादिष्टम्।

कीर्तिर्मालवभूपतेर्मम कलासख्या समं सत्वरं
धावन्ती मिलिता क्व यासि कलयेत्युक्त्वा वदत्साहसम्[2]।
मर्यादामधिकृत्यभूमिवलये किं ते गते कारणं
विद्वद्वृन्दनिमन्त्रणाय जगतः स्वस्वामिना प्रेषिता ॥४१॥

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहो असहायस्य मे महानसौ भाग्यभाजनं सहायः सम्पन्नः।

प्रतिष्ठा—सत्यं स्वामिन्

महासहायः सम्पन्नः कीर्तिस्ते मण्डपेशितुः।
ददती कल्पवल्लीव लीलयैव तवेप्सितम् ॥४१(क)॥

वृत्तिवल्लभः—प्रिये कला सम्प्रति लीलया क्व विलसति।

प्रतिष्ठा—तस्यैव मण्डपाचलमहीमघवतो विलासवेश्मनि। तत्पृच्छाम्येनाम्।

ततः प्रविशति कला।

कला मान्या राज्ञां मनसिजमहामोहनशरः
सुधांशोः सर्वस्वं शिवशिरसि चूड़ामणिरहम्।
कलाहीनः कश्चित् क्वचिदपि न शोभामनुभवे-
दुदासीनस्तस्माद्गुणनिधिनृपः कोऽपि न मयि ॥४२॥

वृत्तिवल्लभः—प्रतिष्ठे यदि कलास्वामिनी कृपयति तत्फलितमस्मन्मनोरथैः।

प्रतिष्ठा—सत्यं स्वामिन्

यद्येषास्ति सहायिनी तव कला पृष्ठे प्रतिष्ठास्म्यहं
तत्त्वं पूर्णमनोरथोऽसि सुकवे खेदं वृथा मा वृथाः।
राजानः शतशोऽपि सन्तिभुवने विद्याविनोदप्रिया-
स्तेभ्यस्त्वं स्थिरवृत्तिमेत्य सुकवे विश्वेशमाराधय ॥४३॥

वृत्तिवल्लभः—(कलास्वामिनीमाश्रिता)—मातः किमाह कीर्तिमालव-महीभर्तुः।

---

1. .....चिन्तयाहरे।

2. ...सा दिशा (?)—this is written by a different handwriting साहसम् was given originally.

कला—वत्स तदाकर्णय। प्रचण्डदण्डेनडिण्डिमडमत्कामातन्वतीयदुक्तवती मण्डपाचलमहीमघवतः कीर्तिः।

कलावन्तो लोकाः कृपणनृपतिद्वारि किमिति
प्रतिष्ठां स्वाभिष्टां गमयत कदाशाकवलिताः।
मया कीर्त्याहूताः पटुपटहघोषैर्मदधिपं
कलानां भोक्तारं भजत सुधियो मण्डपपतिम् ॥४४

वृत्तिवल्लभः—तन्मातः सकलजगद्याचकनिमन्त्रणायोद्यतयानया मण्डपमहीमघवतः कीर्त्या वयं साधारणकारणमात्रेणोपलक्षितास्तत्प्रायोऽस्मद्ग्रहवैषम्यविलसितमेव। तथाप्येषा स्वभावसौभाग्यसीमाऽस्मन्महोपकाराय प्रवर्तते एव। यतो निर्भयभावेन विश्वेश्वरराजधानीं मामनुप्रेषयति। अहो महीमूदमहीपते यत् किं तन्मे महोपकाराय। यतः

चित्रं श्रीमहिमूदशाहनृपतेः, प्रौढः प्रसादः सतां
सर्वेषामभिवाञ्छितं वितरति प्रायेण कल्पद्रुवत्।
कोपश्चित्रमिदं विचित्रकविताख्यातिं नवीनां नये-
दौदासीन्यमहो मदीयमधुना काशीनिवासाय मे ॥४५

अहो महच्चित्रं यदस्य प्रतिकूलतामप्यनुकूलतां कलयति कलावताम्। तन्मातः किमुक्तवती कीर्तिः।

कला—वत्स पृष्ठपुरः समागतेयं कीर्तिमण्डपमहीमहेन्द्रस्य। इयं स्वमुखेन सर्वमावेदयिष्यति।

ततः प्रविशति कीर्तिः। डिण्डिमध्वनेरनन्तरं कलावन्तो लोका इति पठति। पुनर्डिण्डिमध्वनेरनन्तरम्।

किं भो कवीन्द्राः कृपणनृपद्वारि भो हितं शृणुत।
दातुं दत्तावसरं मण्डपपतिमाशु यात किं बहुना ॥४६

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहो अस्मन्सहायसामग्री सम्पन्ना। (कीर्तिं प्रणम्य) मातः कीर्ते दिष्ट्या ते दर्शनं जातम् (करसम्पुटं विधाय)।

श्रीमत्साहगयासदोनदयिते कीर्ते त्वदङ्के मया
न्यस्तमस्तकमस्ति विश्वविदिता त्वं कामधेनुः कवेः।
त्वं मातासि कलावतामिह लघुं पुत्रं प्रतिष्ठान्वितं
कल्याणेन यथा कथञ्चिदपि मां विश्वेश्वरं प्रापय ॥४७

कीर्तिः—वत्स मनोवाञ्छादधिकतरान्मनोरथान् पूरयामि। तदहं विद्वत्-कविकलावतां जननी कीर्तिर्महीमहेन्द्रग्यासदीनस्य। आकर्णय—

आसिन्धुक्षितिनायकानभिमुखानानीयसोपायना-
नाभूमिप्रणिपातजातविनयं ते कारयिष्याम्यहम्।
तत्सर्वस्वमपि त्वदीयपदयोः सन्मोचयन्ती कवे
कीर्तिमण्डपभूपतेरियमहं वाराणसीं त्वां नये ॥४८

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहो सिद्धमस्मन्मनोरथैस्तद्व्रजामः सत्वरमितो दुजनजर्जराद्-गुर्जरदेशाद्विश्वेश्वरराजधानीम्। (इति प्रस्थानमारभते। किञ्चिदिव परिक्रम्य स्वदेशसौभाग्यमन्तःस्मरन्नातिहृष्टमनाः।)

हा हन्त गुर्जरधरे विहाय भवतीं व्रजामि कां वसतिम्।
त्रिदिवादिवाहमपतं महिमूदेन्द्र प्रसादतः स्खलितः ॥४९

इति सगद्गदं पुनः पठति।

शतशोऽपि सन्तिदेशाः क्वचन न तुल्योऽस्ति गुर्जरेण गुणैः।
राज्ञामस्ति सहस्रं न पुनर्महिमूदभुजा सदृशः ॥५०
कमिह कृपालुनृपालं रसिकतरं सत्कलाभिराराध्य।
धनकोटि कोटिकानां सहस्रमप्राप्य विस्मराम्येनम् ॥५१

(शिरः कम्पमानो नानन्दितमनाः प्रस्थातुमीहते)

(अत्रान्तरे लज्जा आशा सखीकरमवलम्बमाना सरभसमागत्य प्रयानाभि-मुखस्य वृत्तिवल्लभस्य चेलाञ्चलं दधाना विविधोपदेशवचनैः प्रयाणं निषेधयन्ती जननीवोपदिशति)।

[लज्जा]—आः वत्स किं विस्मृतम्।

आजन्मप्रतिपालितोऽसि कृपया यस्य प्रियालालितो
भिक्षुस्त्वं कविराजराजपदवीं संप्रापितः प्रत्यहम्।
नानादानमहाभिमानवसतीर्यल्लीलया निर्मित-
स्तद्विस्मृत्य दिनत्रयेण कुमते देशान्तरं प्रस्थितः ॥५२

वृत्तिवल्लभः—लज्जे मातः। आशे स्वसः। शृणुत भवत्यौ। किमहं कृतघ्न इव सुखपरम्परां भोक्तुं व्रजामि।

लज्जा—कथय किमन्यत् प्रयाणप्रयोजनं ते। यदेनं सकलकलारसालं भूपालं विहाय भूपान्तरं गन्तुमनाः।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अहो गोप्यमपि गमनकारणं मातुरग्रे प्रकाश्यमेव ।

आकर्णय—मत्स्वामी शरदिन्दुसुन्दररुचिर्येन ज्वलत्पावका-
प्रख्योऽसौ विहितोहितः स जगतां येनादितो निर्मितः ।
दीर्घायुः स भवत्वहो पुनरहं स्वस्वामिकीर्तिं गृणन्
वैरी क्षोणीभृतां स्फुरद्गजघटादन्तप्रहारास्पदम् ॥५३

मातरमहमन्यत्र गच्छामि तत् किं मनोवाञ्छितं प्राप्तुम् । विधिविलसितमप्रतिहतम् । किं करवाणि । तेन व्रजामि न पुनः सांसारिकसुखान्युपभोक्तुम् । आकर्णय—

निदाघे गङ्गायास्तटनिकटवर्ती सुरतरुः
सिषेवे येनोच्चैरभिमतः फलत्यागरसिकः ।
न तस्मै रोचन्ते खदिरवदरीचञ्चलदला
रसालाः कागोष्ठीकरिहतकरीरक्षितिरुहाम् ॥५४

लज्जा—पिशुनजनाभिभूतमानसस्त्वं कथमात्मनोऽमङ्गलवचो भाषसे ।
खिन्नो दुर्जनदुर्वचोभिरभितः कस्मादकस्मादिदं
वत्सात्मानममङ्गलेन वचसा संयोजयस्यादरात् ।
अस्योच्चैर्महिमूदशाहनृपतेः कीर्तिं पुनः कुर्वतो
युक्तं मत्तगजाधिरोहणमहो दन्तिप्रहाराः कुतः ॥५५

वत्स मानसमाश्वासय । माभूः परिभवभाजनम् । मनोगतं दुःखजातमावेदय माम् । यदहं स्वामिने निवेद्य सकलमपि ते दुःखजातं दूरीकरोमि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—मातर्लज्जे समाकर्णय । प्रत्यहमुत्पद्यमानानां नवनवानर्थपरम्परामेकया जीह्वया वक्तुमपि न पारयामि । तथाप्याकर्णय—

खिन्नो वृत्तिवियोगतः पुनरहं राजप्रसादोज्झितो
वासः खण्डमिदं वहामि शिरसा क्षुद्रं हरिद्राङ्कितम् ।
त्यक्त्वोच्चैर्वरवाहनानि शकटारूढो वहन सर्वतो
राजद्वारि तिरस्कृतोऽपि बहुधा लज्जे न लज्जे कथम् ॥५६

लज्जा—मा विषीद वत्स नैतद्राजकृतम् ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—भ्रातः एर्वारुचौरस्य कलतलप्रहार एवोचितः नतु खड्गप्रहार-परम्परां प्रचारः ।

प्रेमपात्रं प्रतिकृतः कोपः किं नास्य लज्जते ।
प्रहार इव खड्गस्य कान्ताकुचयुगं प्रति ॥५७

किञ्च

कोपः कलावतां कालो भृकुटी प्रकटीकृतः ।
कामिनीनां मनोन्मादवारणं वारणैः किमु ॥५८

लज्जा—वत्स नायं तत्त्वतो राजकोपः । किन्तु शिक्षणार्थं सर्वलोकानाम् । मा विषीद । (आशां प्रति) सखि आशे वृत्तिवियोगविह्वलं तुरगाधिरोहतिरस्कृतं त्वमेनं आश्वासय ।

आशा—भ्रातः परिहर दैन्यम् । मा विषीद । समाकर्णय ।

मद्ग्रामान् सहसोपहृत्य नृपतिः प्रादात् परस्मै कथं
मा चिन्तामिति वृत्तिवल्लभ वृथा यद्वाजिनं त्याजितः ।
देशान् दातुमसौ क्षमस्तव न किं नीत्वारिभूमीभुजां
त्वामारोहयितुं नवान्[1] करिवरान् नासीरदीनः क्षणात् ॥५९
ब्रह्मेव प्रतिवासरं न विषमः सर्वेषु लोकेष्वयं
संसर्गात् स्फटिकप्रभेव विविधान् वर्णानसौ दर्शयेत् ।
रक्तोऽप्येष विरक्तवत् परकृतौ कोपप्रसादावुभौ
राजा निर्मल एव यत् कृतिरियं तानेव निर्भत्सय ॥६०

तदिदानीं सेवया स्वामिनमाराधय विशेषेण मन्त्रिणोऽनुनयन् विशेषेण धर्माधिकारिणां चरणान् गृहाण । प्रकारान्तरं पुनरत्र न पश्याम्यशरणस्य ते । अन्यच्च सम्बलरहितस्य ते वाराणसीगमनप्यसाध्यम् ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—मातस्तदेव कर्तुमुद्यतोऽस्मि । पुनरिहेदमसाध्यमधुना ।

स्वामी चन्दनवृक्षयन् द्विरसनैः रुद्धः कलाजीविना ।
भिक्षावृत्तिविलुण्ठनाय रिपवोऽभूवन्नमी मन्त्रिणः ।
न्याये ये नियुतास्त एव हि महानर्थस्य मूलं ततः
कीर्तिः कल्पलतेव वाञ्छितफलं ते सम्बलं दास्यति ॥६१

---

1. नवा करिवरान् ।

सम्बलेनापि नो कार्यं न भूपान्तरसेवया ।
मनोगतमजानन्त्या नाशया नापि लज्जया ॥६२

तत् सर्वथा प्रतिज्ञापूर्वकमनङ्गीकृतान्यदानस्य सम्बलरहितस्य मे वाराणसी-गमनप्यसाध्यमिव पश्यामि ।

आशे गच्छ गृहं दिनानि कतिचित्तिष्ठ प्रतिष्ठेऽन्तिके
लज्जे मुञ्च ममाञ्चलं कुरु कले साम्राज्यमुच्चैस्तव ।
य कोटेरधिकं धनं मम लघोः प्रादात्तदानृन्यभू-
र्देहान्तेन भवामि कीर्तिपटहक्वाणैः पुरो वैरिणाम् ॥६३

आशा—मा विषीद । करुणासखीमुखेन स्वामिने निवेद्य सकलमपि ते दुःखं दूरीकरोमि । तदाहमाशा स्वसा ते ।

भ्रातः परिहरदैन्यं करुणा जागर्ति गुर्जराधिपतेः ।
या जगतामपि जीवनहेतुः सा तामुपेक्षते कस्मात् ॥६४

वृत्तिवल्लभः—दया राज्ञो लीलाम्बुधितलनिमग्ना तव सखी
श्रमात्सुप्ता लज्जे जगदुपकृतिं सा विदधती ।
हता हिंस्रैः किंवा किमुतदलिता लोभकरिणा
यतो नाविर्भूता गृहचटकघातस्य समये ॥६५

आशे स्वसः सत्यमेवैतत् । सा स्वामिकरुणा जगज्जीवनमेव । पुनर्ग्रह-वैषम्यवशेन मे सकलं जगद्विपरीतं जातमिति बिभेमि ।

आशा—मा भैषीः ।

उदेति भानुर्वारुण्यां वह्निः शैत्यमुपैति चेत् ।
तत्प्रभोर्महिमूदस्य करुणाप्येति विक्रियाम् ॥६६

वृत्तिवल्लभः—आशे येऽस्माभिः सत्कारपरम्पराभिरभिवर्द्धिताः सम्प्रति तेऽस्मद्विज्ञप्तिमात्रमपि न कुर्वन्ति ।

आशा—भ्रातः का ते विज्ञप्तिः । व्याहर सर्वमहं करुणामुखेन स्वामिने निवेदयामि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—आशे श्वसस्तदिमां विज्ञप्तिश्लोकं[1] करुणामुखेन स्वामिने निवेदय ।

---

1. शंवलेना..... ।

येषामप्युपकारकारणमहं ते वैरिणो मेऽभव-
न्नित्यं ये स्तुतिवादिनः सपदि ते कर्णेजपा भूपतेः ।
सम्पत्तिर्विपदि भवद्धनमहो लोष्ट्रायितं सर्वतोऽ-
लभ्यं देयमभूत्त्वयि प्रकुपिते नासीरदीनक्षणात् ॥६७
स्वामिन् यद्यपि तैर्गुणैः स्तुतिमयैः काव्यैर्नवैर्नाटकैः
सङ्गीतैरभिवर्द्धिता कविषु ते शाताकृता साम्प्रतम् ।
तत्तेषां ग्रहयोगतः पुनरहो सामान्यतस्ते प्रजा-
मात्रस्यापि कृता समु[2] .....वीन् कस्मादकस्मादिव ॥६८
त्वदङ्घ्रिविरहव्यथां नवनवैरनर्थैः समं
प्रभो भगवतो यतः स्थि.....नास्ति मे जीवितम् ।
नचेदहह ते कृपाविरहवेदनैकाग्रता
विदीर्णहृदयस्य किं भवति नाथ संजीव(नम्।[3]) ॥६९
नाथ त्वं नवनाटकानि रचयन् नाना प्रबन्धान् गृणन्
गायन् गीतपरम्परां तव मुदा काव्यानि कुर्वन् मुदा ।
दत्त्वा कोटिमितं च भवता दानाभिमानीकृतः
कं भूपालमुपैति ते कविरसौ नासीरदी.....श ॥७०

(ततः) आशा (करुणामुपानयन्ती वृत्तिवल्लभं प्रति)—वत्स ते वाञ्छितार्था सिद्धिर्जाता वितर.....पनिकाम् । सकल जगत्कल्पलतयानया करुणया कृतार्थीकृतोऽसि ।

करुणा—मा चिन्तां कुरु वृत्तिवल्लभ सुखं तिष्ठ प्रतिष्ठासुखं
भुञ्जानो गुणसिन्धुगुर्जरपतेर्गायन् गुणान् सर्वतः ।
प्रायश्चित्तमियं गृहीतुमिव किं मिथ्याभिशप्ता सती
वृत्तिस्ते पुरतः करोति शपथान् नान्येनभुक्तेत्यहम् ॥७१

वृत्ति—शृणु स्वामिन्
त्वत्तो वियोजिता दुष्टैर्नानीता नृपमन्दिरम् ।
कष्टमुत्कृष्टमेतन्मे लुण्ठाकैर्लुंठितान्तरे ॥७२

1. विज्ञप्तिश्लोकौ... ।
2. Letters eaten up by insects.
3. Restored by us.

करुणा—वत्स यत्त्वद्गृहीतं सर्वस्वं तत्ते राजसेवा प्रत्यर्पयिष्यति ।

(ततः प्रविशति राजसेवा)

राजसेवा—सौभाग्यं महिमूदशाहनृपते करुणे मेरोर्महत् स्वं कृतं
भूमीन्द्र लघुभिक्षुकस्य भवनं प्रत्यानयन्त्या त्वया ।
चिन्तोद्दामदवाग्निदग्धमनसामुज्जीवनं कुर्वती
भक्तानामभयप्रदे चिरतरं तत्त्वं प्रजां पालय ॥७३

करुणा—वृत्तिवल्लभ किं ते भूयः प्रियमुपकरोमि ।

वृत्तिवल्लभः—अतःपरं किं मे प्रियमस्ति । तथापीदमस्तु ।
लोकानां वाञ्छितार्थं वितरतु वसुधा कामवर्षं पयोदाः
कुर्वन्तु क्षोणिपालाः सुतमिव सततं स्वप्रजां पालयन्तु ।
दुष्टानामिष्टनाशो भवतु भुवि सदा सज्जनानामभीष्टं
भूयादाचन्द्रतारं निवसतु करुणा मानसे भूमिपानाम् ॥७४

इति श्रीव्यासलघुकविविरचितं वृत्तिवल्लभं नाम छायानाटकं समाप्तम् । श्रीः ॥

कूपे पानमधोमुखस्य हि भवेत् व्याप्यो वराक्यः स्त्रियः
सामान्यवकटिट्टिभैः सह सरस्येवं समालोकयन् ।
नादत्त तृषितोऽपि हीनसलिलं क्रूरैर्वृतं जन्तुभि-
र्मानादुन्नतकन्धरः सुरपतिं तच्चातको याचते ॥१
चातकः स्वाभिमानेन जलं प्रार्थयतेऽम्बुदात् ।
सस्वौदार्यतया नित्यं प्लावयत्यम्बुना महीम् ॥२

चातकस्य मुखचञ्चुसम्पुटे नो पतन्ति यदि वारिबिन्दवः ।
सागरीकृत महीतलस्य किं दोष एव जलदस्य दीयते ॥३
कठिनकुठारच्छेदं घर्षणमपि निर्भरं सहते ।
कुचपरिरम्भणलोभाच्चन्दनमिन्दीवराक्षीणाम् ॥४
मनो मे नायातं किमुतकुचयोरन्तरगतं
किमुद्धर्षधस्तं किमुत विरहाग्नौ निपतितम् ।
तरुण्या लावण्यामृतसरसि मग्नं किमथवा
चरन्मारश्चौरः किमु समहरद् यौवनधने ॥५

दिव्यं [1]चूतरसं पीत्वा न गर्वं याति कोकिलः।
पीत्वा कर्दमपानीयं भेको भकभकायते ॥६
अपदो दूरगामी च साक्षरो न च पण्डितः।
मौनी संस्कृतवक्ता च समुद्रो वारिवर्जितः ॥७

श्रीरस्तु। श्रीः॥ श्रीः॥ श्रीः॥

1. नूतः.....।